arXiv:1003.4862v1 [quant-ph] 25 Mar 2010

SLOCC invariants as expectation values and their experimental detection

Andreas Osterloh
Fakultät für Physik, Campus Duisburg, Universität Duisburg-Essen, Lotharstr. 1, 47048 Duisburg, Germany

Jens Siewert
Departamento de Química Física, Universidad del País Vasco -
Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, Apdo. 644, 48080 Bilbao, Spain and
Ikerbasque, Basque Foundation for Science, Alameda Urquijo 36, 48011 Bilbao, Spain

Characterization and quantification of multipartite entanglement is one of the challenges in state-of-the-art experiments in quantum information processing. According to theory, this is achieved via entanglement monotones, that is, functions that do not increase under stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC). Typically such monotones include the wave function and its time-reversal (anti-linear operator formalism) or they are based on not completely positive maps (e.g. partial transpose). Therefore, they are not directly accessible to experimental observations. We show how entanglement monotones derived from polynomial local SL-invariants can be re-written in terms of expectation values of observables. Consequently, the amount of entanglement – of specific SLOCC classes – in a given state can be extracted from the measurement of correlation functions of local operators.

Introduction. – The preparation of multipartite quantum states and the characterization of their entanglement properties is one of the central issues of ongoing experimental research in quantum-information processing. Technological progress has made it possible to generate, e.g., GHZ and W states for three and more qubits with trapped ions (up to eight qubits, [1, 2]) and photons (up to six qubits, [3, 4]). Moreover, an entangled four-qubit state that is locally inequivalent from the GHZ state, the so-called cluster state could be generated with photons [5, 6].

The experimental detection of entanglement is a rather subtle issue [7, 8]. Until now, the experimental characterization of entanglement has been carried out using entanglement witnesses or Bell inequalities (for a recent review see [9]). The advantage of these methods is that the presence of entanglement in a given state can be inferred simply by measuring certain correlation functions of local observables. Although these methods are not strictly quantitative since to date there is no formulation of these concepts such that their results are invariant under stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC) [10], recent proposals exist on how (tight) lower bounds can be extracted with variable numerical effort [11–13].

On the other hand, necessary criteria for the quantification of entanglement have been worked out and lead to the concept of the *entanglement monotone* [14]. Essential properties are local $SU(2)$ invariance, convexity on the space of density matrices and non-increasing value under local operations and classical communication (LOCC). The non-increasing property needs to be extended to include also stochastic local operations and classical communication (SLOCC)[15, 16]. The connection between SLOCC and invariance under local $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ has been established[15–17]. Based on this, the two SLOCC-inequivalent entanglement classes for three qubits have been discovered whose representatives are the W and the GHZ state [15]. While the former state exclusively contains pairwise entanglement (measured by the concurrence [18]), a measure for the latter has been derived for pure states, the 3-tangle[19]. Subsequently much work has been devoted to the classification of N-partite qubit entanglement ($N > 3$) [20–26], but up to now it is not clear what the essential criteria for such a characterization might be. However, it is known that local $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ invariance plays a major role [27], and $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ invariants – both from classical invariant theory [22, 28–32] as well as from other methods [17, 23] – can be written in terms of the coefficients of a state alone (and *not* their complex conjugate in contrast to SU(2) invariants) and thus are naturally represented as expectation values of certain antilinear operators [24, 33]. This has the drawback that those quantities are not directly accessible in an experiment. Interestingly, also other prominent entanglement measures related to not completely positive operators (as the Peres-Horodecki criterion [34, 35]) share this draw-back, which might indicate that sensible measures for entanglement are hard to access experimentally for conceptual reasons [8, 36]. For measures as the negativity the obstacles from dealing with not completely positive maps can be circumvented by adding the identity map [37] or by certain contraction techniques [38]. The addition of an identity map has also been applied to the concurrence [39]. In this work, we demonstrate how the antilinear formalism in Ref. [23, 24] - and hence *all* polynomial $SL(2,\mathbb{C})^{\otimes q}$ invariants [33] - can be directly rewritten in terms of linear operators and expectation values thereof by means of an invertible mapping [40]. This combines the advantages of experimental accessibility and controlled quantification of entanglement (intimately related to SL invariance). It provides experimentalists with a tool to directly measure genuine multipartite qubit entanglement. The mapping itself does not require qubits as local entities and therefore it could readily be applied to future SL invariants also for higher local dimension (e.g. for higher spin). On the other hand a connection to alternative approaches based directly on expectation values of linear operators (see e.g. [41]) can be established by means of the inverse mapping. This comparison also highlights the advantage of an antilinear formulation as far as the construction of e.g. complete sets of invariants is concerned for future progress in entanglement classification.

The paper is organized as follows. After briefly reviewing the antilinear formalism we present the connection with linear expectation values. Then we discuss some basic conditions to measure such expectation values in an experiment.

Antilinear formalism.– In Refs. [23, 24] we have shown that SLOCC invariants can be obtained via the expectation values of antilinear operators, as a straightforward generalization of the well-known entanglement measures concurrence $C(\phi) = |\langle\phi|\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y \mathfrak{C}|\phi\rangle|$ for a two-qubit state $|\phi\rangle$ and 3-tangle $\tau_3(\chi)$ for a three-qubit state $|\chi\rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_3(\chi) &= |\langle\chi|\sigma_\mu \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y \mathfrak{C}|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|\sigma^\mu \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y \mathfrak{C}|\chi\rangle| \qquad (1)\\ &= |\langle\chi| \bullet \langle\chi|(\sigma_\mu \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y) \bullet (\sigma^\mu \otimes \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)\mathfrak{C}|\chi\rangle \bullet |\chi\rangle| \quad . \qquad (2)\end{aligned}$$

Here the symbol $\bullet$ indicates a tensor product where the jth factor is related to the jth copy of $|\chi\rangle$, σ_μ are the Pauli matrices ($\sigma_y \equiv \sigma_2$, $\sigma_0 \equiv \mathbb{1}$) and $\mathfrak{C}$ is the complex conjugation operator. The "metric" for the contraction of lower and upper indices is $g_{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{diag}\,\{1, -1, 0, -1\}$. In Eq. (2) it is evident how the 3-tangle can be written as an expectation value of an antilinearly hermitian operator with respect to a multiple copy of the state $|\chi\rangle$. The basic ingredient for the construction of global antilinear operators ("filters") are local operators ("combs") that have zero expectation value for any pure state of the local Hilbert space. The two simplest independent combs are

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}_1 &= \sigma_y \mathfrak{C} \qquad (3)\\ \mathcal{O}_2 &= \sigma_\mu \bullet \sigma^\mu \mathfrak{C} := \sum_{\mu,\nu=0}^{3} g_{\mu\nu} \sigma_\mu \bullet \sigma_\nu \mathfrak{C} \ . \qquad (4)\end{aligned}$$

Linear expectation values.– Consider now an q-qubit state $|\psi\rangle$. Any polynomial q-qubit $SL^{\otimes q}$ invariant (an antilinear expectation value of several copies of the pure state state) can be expressed in terms of linear observables after rewriting the product of the (complex) q-qubit invariant and its complex conjugate expression

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\psi|\hat{O} \otimes \ldots |\psi^*\rangle \ \ldots \ \langle\psi^*|\hat{O}^T \otimes \ldots |\psi\rangle \cdots &= (\langle\psi| \circ \langle\psi^*|) \bullet \ldots \left[(\hat{O} \circ \hat{O}^T) \bullet \ldots\right] \otimes \ldots (|\psi^*\rangle \circ |\psi\rangle) \bullet \ldots\\ &= (\langle\psi| \circ \langle\psi^*|) \bullet \ldots \left[(\hat{O} \circ \hat{O}^T) \bullet \cdots \prod_j \mathbb{P}_{j,k}\right] \otimes \ldots (|\psi\rangle \circ |\psi^*\rangle) \bullet \ldots \qquad (5)\end{aligned}$$

Here we have rearranged the factors and introduced the symbol $\circ$ to indicate the tensor product of the jth copy and the corresponding copy from the complex conjugate expression. The square brackets enclose – for the kth qubit – as many pair-wise $\circ$ products as there are copies of the state $|\psi\rangle$ in the antilinear expression of the invariant. The permutation operator $\mathbb{P}_{j,k}$ exchanges the jth copy of the kth qubit with the jth copy of the kth qubit in the complex conjugate expression [49] and the product extends (for the kth qubit) over all copies j of that qubit.

Now, even the complex conjugation in the copies $|\psi^*\rangle$ can be removed by including a *partial* complex conjugation acting on all operator factors to the right of a $\circ$ symbol. It is worth mentioning that since we deal with Hermitean operators, this partial complex conjugation is equivalent to a *partial transpose*. As an illustration of the presented invertible mapping we quote the result for the concurrence

$$
\begin{aligned}
|C(\phi)|^2 &= \langle\phi|\sigma_y\otimes\sigma_y|\phi^*\rangle\langle\phi^*|\sigma_y\otimes\sigma_y|\phi\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{4}M_{\mu\nu}M_{\kappa\lambda}\langle\phi|\circ\langle\phi|(\sigma_\mu\otimes\sigma_\kappa)\circ(\sigma_\nu\otimes\sigma_\lambda)|\phi\rangle\circ|\phi\rangle\ ; \qquad M_{\mu\nu}=\text{diag}\,\{1,-1,-1,-1\}\ . \qquad (6)
\end{aligned}
$$

In the above equation, the symbol "$\circ$" stands for a usual tensor product; we use a different symbol for highlighting that different copies of the same state are multiplicatively combined where the different copies arise from taking the absolute square of an SL invariant. In contrast, "$\bullet$" indicates tensor products of different copies of the pure state leading to a given homogeneous degree of the (complex) polynomial SL invariant (see above), and "$\otimes$" represents the tensor product structure of the multi-qubit Hilbert space into single qubits. Note that the metric $M_{\mu\nu}$ for the summation in Eq. (6) is precisely the Minkowski metric.

Hence, we have found a rule to write the linear operator corresponding to a comb $\mathcal{O}=\hat{O}\ \mathfrak{C}$ as

$$
\mathfrak{L}[\hat{O}] := (\mathbb{1}\circ\mathfrak{C})(\hat{O}\circ\hat{O})\mathbb{P} \qquad (7)
$$

where the complex conjugation acts only on the operator factors in $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathbb{P}$ to the right of the $\circ$ symbol. For the comb $\sigma_\mu\bullet\sigma^\mu$ we find

$$
\mathfrak{L}[\sigma_\mu\bullet\sigma^\mu] = \mathfrak{G}_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu}(\sigma_\kappa\bullet\sigma_\lambda)\circ(\sigma_\mu\bullet\sigma_\nu) \qquad (8)
$$

where we have defined

$$
\mathfrak{G}_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu} = \delta_{\kappa+\lambda,3}\delta_{\lambda+\nu,3}|\varepsilon_{\kappa\mu}\varepsilon_{\lambda\nu}|\mathcal{H}_{\mu\nu} + \delta_{\kappa\mu}\delta_{\lambda\nu}\mathcal{J}_{\mu\nu} \qquad (9)
$$

with the matrices

$$
\mathcal{H} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{J} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix} \qquad (10)
$$

These results represent a prescription to express arbitrary polynomial $SL(2,\mathbb{C})^{\otimes q}$ invariants in terms of expectation values of linear operators. The principal idea of the mapping (7) is generic to SL invariants and not limited to qubits. Clearly, the elegance of the antilinear formalism can be noted by comparing Eq. (1) to the more cumbersome representation of the 3-tangle in terms of spin correlation functions (the formal existence of such an expression for the threetangle has been observed in [42], giving an expression in terms of projectors)

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\tau_3(\chi)|^2 &= M_{\mu_1,\nu_1}M_{\mu_2,\nu_2}M_{\mu_3,\nu_3}M_{\mu_4,\nu_4}\mathfrak{G}_{\kappa\lambda\mu\nu}\langle\chi|\sigma_{\mu_1}\sigma_{\mu_2}\sigma_\kappa|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|\sigma_{\mu_1}\sigma_{\mu_2}\sigma_\lambda|\chi\rangle \\
&\quad \langle\chi|\sigma_{\mu_3}\sigma_{\mu_4}\sigma_\mu|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|\sigma_{\mu_3}\sigma_{\mu_4}\sigma_\nu|\chi\rangle \quad . \qquad (11) \\
&= \mathfrak{G}_{\kappa_1\lambda_1\mu_1\nu_1}\mathfrak{G}_{\kappa_2\lambda_2\mu_2\nu_2}\mathfrak{G}_{\kappa_3\lambda_3\mu_3\nu_3}\langle\chi|\sigma_{\kappa_1}\sigma_{\kappa_2}\sigma_{\kappa_3}|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|\sigma_{\lambda_1}\sigma_{\lambda_2}\sigma_{\lambda_3}|\chi\rangle \\
&\quad \langle\chi|\sigma_{\mu_1}\sigma_{\mu_2}\sigma_{\mu_3}|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|\sigma_{\nu_1}\sigma_{\nu_2}\sigma_{\nu_3}|\chi\rangle \quad . \qquad (12)
\end{aligned}
$$

Although this clearly favors the antilinear framework from a conceptual point of view, Eqs. (11), (12) are important for practical purposes: they are a prescription for how the 3-tangle of a pure state could be directly measured in an experiment.

An interesting conclusion from this approach is that it clarifies the relation between SL invariants and a proposal to use the projection operators P_- and P_+ to assess entanglement in multipartite qubit systems [41]. To this end we note that the linear operator corresponding to $\sigma_y\mathfrak{C}$ (cf. Eq. (6)) equals precisely the operator P_- in Ref. [41], which proves $SL(2,\mathbb{C})$ invariance of P_-. On the other hand, P_+ is not SL invariant, which becomes also evident, when we transform it back to the anti-linear framework

$$
\langle\psi|\circ\langle\psi|P_+|\psi\rangle\circ|\psi\rangle = \gamma_{\mu\nu}\langle\psi|\sigma_\mu|\psi^*\rangle\langle\psi^*|\sigma_\nu|\psi\rangle\ ; \qquad \gamma_{\mu\nu}=\text{diag}\,\{1,1,0,1\} \qquad (13)
$$

and take into account the results from Ref. [23]. As a consequence, an expression for qubits constructed exclusively from P_- in the way proposed in Ref. [41] coincide with the well-known N-tangle proposed by Wong and

Christensen [43] for an even number of qubits. Its use as a measure of multipartite entanglement has certain limitations [43, 44], but an analytic convex roof extension is available [45]. This applies to every SL invariant constructed in Ref. [41]. A further limitation is that those quantities are polynomial local SU invariants with homogeneous degree limited to 4.

On the other hand, the mapping (7) of $\hat{O} = \sigma_y$ and results from [33] show how P_- can be used for constructing SL invariants of higher homogeneous polynomial degree. This procedure is entirely equivalent to employing full singlet contractions with the spinor metric tensor in the anti-linear framework (see e.g. [17]); the latter method has been demonstrated to be considerably less efficient than using the pair of combs proposed in [23].

Experimental detection.–

Now let us discuss the possibility of measuring a quantity such as the squared 3-tangle in Eq. (11). As to experiments, one has to deal with mixed states $\rho = (1-\varepsilon)|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| + \varepsilon\tilde{\rho}$ with some admixture $\tilde{\rho}$, where $\langle\Psi|\tilde{\rho}|\Psi\rangle = 0$ without loss of generality. This has two consequences: *i)* the 3-tangle typically will be reduced, $\tau_3(\rho) \le \tau_3(\Psi)$, and *ii)* the quantity on the r.h.s. of Eq. (11) looses its significance for growing ε, as the experimentally measured correlation functions are expectation values for ρ rather than for $|\Psi\rangle$: $\langle\ldots\rangle = \mathrm{tr}(\rho\ldots)$. In case of non-systematic errors, it should be reasonable, as a first approach, to assume this erroneous admixture to be completely uncorrelated/unpolarized, i.e. proportional to the identity on the orthogonal complement of $|\Psi\rangle$. For the discussion of unpolarized noise, we rewrite

$$\rho = (1-\varepsilon)|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| + \frac{\varepsilon}{d}\mathbb{1} \tag{14}$$

where d is the dimension of the Hilbert space: for q qubits we have $d = 2^q$. The identity matrix will only give a contribution for the identity operator, since any appearing Pauli matrix leads to trace zero. Then, the error of type *ii)* is easily estimated as

$$C^2_{\mathrm{exp}} = C^2(\psi) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\left(5C^2(\psi) - 1\right) \tag{15}$$

for the 2-tangle, i.e. the concurrence squared, and

$$\tau_3^{\mathrm{exp}} = \tau_3(\psi) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\left(9\tau_3(\psi) - 1 + 3M\right) \tag{16}$$

for the 3-tangle, where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned}
M \;&:=\; 3\langle M_z\rangle_\psi^2 - 3\langle M_{zz}\rangle_\psi^2 + \langle M_{zzz}\rangle_\psi^2 \ , \\
\langle M_z\rangle \;&:=\; \frac{1}{3}\sum_{i=1}^{3}\langle\psi|\sigma_z^{(i)}|\psi\rangle \ , \\
\langle M_{zz}\rangle \;&:=\; \frac{1}{3}\sum_{i,j=1}^{3}{}'\,\langle\psi|\sigma_z^{(i)}\sigma_z^{(j)}|\psi\rangle \ , \\
\langle M_{zzz}\rangle \;&:=\; \langle\psi|\sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(2)}\sigma_z^{(3)}|\psi\rangle \ .
\end{aligned}$$

This error applies when the tangle of the dominant pure state is computed in the laboratory using the expression of the pure state tangle in terms of spin expectation values.

Concerning the error type *i)*, the admixture will typically affect the multipartite entanglement in the state beyond the mere loss of weight ε; this is generic when different entanglement classes coexist (see Ref. [46]) and will be referred to as *entanglement interference*. The latter influence is reflected in the convex-roof extension, and this makes this second error considerably more complex. In order to estimate it, we discuss optimal decompositions of weakly mixed states.

Each decomposition vector of the density matrix (14) can be written as follows

$$|\Phi_i\rangle = U_{i,0}\sqrt{1-\varepsilon}|\Psi\rangle + \sum_l U_{i,k}\sqrt{\varepsilon p_k}|\varphi_k\rangle \tag{17}$$

where $\tilde{\rho} = \sum_k p_k|\varphi_k\rangle\langle\varphi_k|$ and U is a block of a unitary matrix, i.e. its column vectors $\vec{u}_k := (U_{0,k}, U_{1,k}, \ldots)$ are orthonormal; in particular $\sum_i |U_{i,k}|^2 = 1$. For $\varepsilon = 0$ the optimal decomposition is trivially given by a single column vector with the only non-zero element being $U_{1,0} = 1$. Continuity arguments for the decomposition vectors show that for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ a $\delta =: \Delta\varepsilon \ll 1$ exists such that

$$U = \left(\begin{array}{cc}
\beta_1 & \\
\vdots & \boldsymbol{\delta_{i,j}} \\
\beta_m & \\
\hline
\alpha_1\sqrt{\Delta\varepsilon} & \\
\alpha_2\sqrt{\Delta\varepsilon} & \boldsymbol{\gamma_{i,j}} \\
\vdots &
\end{array}\right) \tag{18}$$

where $\sum_{j=1}^{N-m}|\alpha_j|^2 = 1$ and without loss of generality $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Δ will typically be of order 1. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{m}\beta_j^2 + \Delta\varepsilon \;&=\; 1 \\
\sum_{i=1}^{m}|\delta_{i,j}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{N-m}|\gamma_{i,j}|^2 \;&=\; 1
\end{aligned}$$

It is worth to notice that the matrix elements $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{i,j}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{i,j}$ will typically be of order one such that U itself will typically not be continuous. The convex roof of τ_3 is its average in the optimal decomposition

$$\widehat{\tau_3} = \sum_i \langle\Phi_i|\Phi_i\rangle^{-1}|\langle\Phi_i|\Sigma_{\mu 22}|\Phi_i^*\rangle\langle\Phi_i|\Sigma^{\mu 22}|\Phi_i^*\rangle| \tag{19}$$

There is one particular case to be distinguished: namely if $m = 1$ and $\delta_{1,j} \equiv 0$. This case corresponds to a situation, where the convex roof close to the state $|\Psi\rangle$ is affine on a range well beyond ε. An example for this is a mixture of a GHZ state and an orthogonal W state as studied in [46, 47], where $\Delta = \frac{1}{2}\frac{p_1}{1-p_1} \sim 1.17$ with

$p_1 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{310}\sqrt{465} \sim 0.71$. Then, the situation simplifies a lot and a lower bound for the entanglement is simply given by $\tau_3[\rho] \geq \tau_3(\psi)(1-2\Delta\varepsilon)$. A drawback of this estimate is however that in a generic experimental setup, it will be difficult to understand whether this scenario applies and what value Δ would have.

For the estimation of $\tau_3[\rho]$ in a generic case, we define $x_j := \sum_{k=1} |U_{j,k}|^2$ and use the relation $\sum_j x_j = r - 1$. This situation corresponds to a situation where the convex roof close to $|\Psi\rangle$ is strictly convex. We need an estimate for the modulus of the states

$$\langle\Phi_i|\Phi_i\rangle = |\beta_j|^2(1-\varepsilon) + \varepsilon \sum_k |\delta_{jk}|^2 p_k \tag{20}$$

which can be given as

$$\begin{aligned} 2\sqrt{\beta^2\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon)x_j p_{min}} &\leq \langle\Phi_i|\Phi_i\rangle \\ &\leq \max\{\beta_j^2(1-\varepsilon), \varepsilon x_j p_{max}\}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where p_{min} and p_{max} are the minimal and maximal weights in $\tilde{\rho}$; we will need the right inequality in what follows. In addition, we employ the very convenient estimate $\left|\sum_{j=1} U_{1,j}\sqrt{\varepsilon p_j}\langle\Psi|\Sigma_{\mu 22}|\Psi^*\rangle\langle\Psi|\Sigma^{\mu 22}|\varphi_j^*\rangle\right| \leq 3\sqrt{2\varepsilon\delta p_{\max}}$, where we have used that the largest eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max}$ of the tangle-operator $\mathfrak{F} = \Sigma_{\mu 22} \bullet \Sigma^{\mu 22}$ has modulus 3.

There appear two essentially different cases from (21), discriminated by the ratio $\beta_{\rm rel} := \frac{\beta_j^2(1-\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon x_j p_{max}}$. If $\beta_{\rm rel} \lesssim 1$ the entanglement is dominated by $\tilde{\rho}$ and the lower bound for its entanglement will be zero. When summing the condition $\beta_j^2(1-\varepsilon) \lesssim \varepsilon x_j p_{max}$ over j we obtain $(1-\varepsilon) \lesssim \varepsilon p_{\max}(r-1)$ defining a rough threshold value for ε beyond which the entanglement must be expected to have dropped to zero. For the analytically solvable case of GHZ-W-mixtures ($r=2$, $p_{\max}=1$) this threshold is $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$. This rough estimate can only indicate an order of magnitude for such a threshold value. Indeed the analytic value for the threetangle to vanish is at $\varepsilon \approx 0.38$ [46]. For unpolarized error of arbitrary rank ($p_{max} = 1/(r-1)$), the threshold stays $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, and the correct value for τ_3 to vanish is at $\varepsilon = 0.25$ [13] (see [48] for specific $r=3$ states).

Assuming now $\beta_{\rm rel} \gg 1$ we obtain after some straight forward algebra that the lowest order deviation is

$$-\varepsilon(\tau_3[|\Psi\rangle] + 24(r-1)p_{max})\ . \tag{22}$$

For both the GHZ-W mixture and the fully unpolarized noise this deviation estimate would amount to $\varepsilon = 0.04$. In all the above formulae, r denotes the rank of ρ. The details of the calculation will be presented elsewhere. The error clearly has a systematic contribution, namely due to the mere lack of weight of the original state, and a contribution due to entanglement interference as reflected in pecularities of the optimal decomposition. It must be noted that the interference term constitutes by far the most relevant term even for small ε: assuming uncorrelated noise in an experiment for three qubits we have $r=8$ and the estimated maximal distructive entanglement interference accumulates to 24ε. This would mean that en experimental error of only five percent could possibly destroy the entanglement of a maximally entanglement GHZ state. In the cross-over region $\beta_{\rm rel} \gtrsim 1$ we use $\langle\Phi_i|\Phi_i\rangle \leq 2\beta_j^2(1-\varepsilon)$ and the deviation up to first order in ε is obtained as

$$-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\tau_3[|\Psi\rangle] + 24(r-1)p_{max})\ . \tag{23}$$

For both the GHZ-W mixture and the fully unpolarized noise this deviation estimate would amount to $\varepsilon = 0.08$. It is clearly seen that at least for weak mixtures to the GHZ state, both estimates are far too conservative. We must emphasize however, that a systematic analysis would be desirable in order to understand how conservative the above estimates are in general.

In contrast to the error depicted in Eq. (16), the above formula attributes for the mixed state tangle of the state actually produced in the laboratory. It is important to note that there is no need to combine both errors to a total error, since they correspond to different quantities to be measured. The first formula provides an experimental check of whether the correct state has been produced (via its tangle characteristics) and a distillation procedure would be necessary to extract it from multiple copies in order to transmit it to quantum information processing. The second formulae rather address the question of how much entanglement there really **is** in the mixed state we have produced in the laboratory for direct submission to a quantum information process.

Conclusions.– We present a one-to-one mapping which translates entanglement measures formulated within an antilinear formalism [23, 24] into expressions in terms of linear operators. These linear expressions have twice the multilinear degree of their more compact originals in the antilinear framework and thus constitutes an undue complication in a theoretical approach to entanglement quantification and classification which most naturally appears within the antilinear formulation. Thus, from a formal point of view our results favor an antilinear approach in order to obtain a deeper understanding of entanglement in multipartite qubit systems. This aspect is particularly important since for defining a proper entanglement order in multipartite systems each class of entanglement should be expected to have its own measure [44].

An important result of this work is an explicit expression of the threetangle in terms of spin expectation values. The transcription of multipartite entanglement measures given as expectation values of antilinear operators in Ref.[23, 24] is straightforward with the results presented here, but it is not the scope of this work to list them explicitly. The invertible mapping (7) from the antilinear to the linear setting is not limited to applications for qubits. As soon as antilinear expressions for polynomial invariants of qudit systems are available, also these can be transcribed using the same technique. The linear counterparts of entanglement measures for true multipartite entanglement [23, 24] are the key for experimentalists to measure genuine multipartite entanglement in a class-specific manner, as a complement to using witnesses; in addition, our results pave the way towards their convex-roof expression, either numerical or analytical, within the linear framework.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank M. Kuś, P. Horodecki and A. Uhlmann for useful discussions.

---

[1] D. Leibfried, E. Knill, S. Seidelin, J. Britton, R. B. Blakestad, J. Chiaverini, D. B. Hume, W. M. Itano, J. D. Jost, C. Langer, et al., Nature **438**, 639 (2005).

[2] H. Haeffner, W. Haensel, C. F. Roos, J. Benhelm, D. C. al kar, M. Chwalla, T. Koerber, U. D. Rapol, M. Riebe, P. O. Schmidt, et al., Nature **438**, 643 (2005).

[3] C.-Y. Lu, X.-Q. Zhou, O. Gühne, W.-B. Gao, J. Zhang, Z.-S. Yuan, A. Goebel, T. Yang, and J.-W. Pan, Nature Physics **3**, 91 (2007).

[4] W. Wieczorek, R. Krischek, N. Kiesel, P. Michelberger, G. Toth, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 020504 (2009).

[5] P. Walther, M. Aspelmeyer, K. J. Resch, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 020403 (2005).

[6] N. Kiesel, C. Schmid, U. Weber, G. Tóth, O. Gühne, R. Ursin, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 210502 (2005).

[7] M. S. Leifer, N. Linden, and A. Winter, Phys Rev A **69**, 052304 (2004).

[8] S. van Enk, N. Lutkenhaus, and H. Kimble, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 052318 (2007).

[9] O. Gühne and G. Toth, Physics Reports **474**, 1 (2009).

[10] D. Bruss, J. I. Cirac, P. Horodecki, F. Hulpke, B. Kraus, M. Lewenstein, and A. Sanpera, J. Mod. Opt. **49**, 1399 (2002).

[11] O. Gühne, M. Reimpell, and R. Werner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 110502 (2007), quant-ph/0607163.

[12] J. Eisert, F. Brandao, and K. Audenaert, New J. Phys. **9**, 46 (2007), quant-ph/0607163.

[13] A. Osterloh and P. Hyllus, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022307 (2010).

[14] G. Vidal, J.Mod.Opt. **47**, 355 (2000).

[15] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 062314 (2000).

[16] C. H. Bennett, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 012307 (2001).

[17] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, and B. D. Moor, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 012103 (2003).

[18] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).

[19] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000).

[20] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. D. Moor, and H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052112 (2002).

[21] A. Miyake, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012108 (2003).

[22] E. Briand, J.-G. Luque, and J.-Y. Thibon, J. Phys. A **36**, 9915 (2003).

[23] A. Osterloh and J. Siewert, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012337 (2005), quant-ph/0410102 on http://de.arxiv.org/.

[24] A. Osterloh and J. Siewert, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **4**, 531 (2006), quant-ph/0506073 on http://de.arxiv.org/.

[25] A. Mandilara, V. M. Akulin, A. V. Smilga, and L. Viola, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 022331 (2006).

[26] L. Lamata, J. Leon, D. Salgado, and E. Solano, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 022318 (2007).

[27] A. Osterloh, App. Phys. B **98**, 609 (2010).

[28] P. Olver, *Classical invariant theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).

[29] S. Albeverio and S.-M. Fei, J. Opt. B **3**, 223 (2001).

[30] G. S. Jaeger, M. Teodorescu-Frumosu, A. V. Sergienko, B. E. A. Saleh, and M. C. Teich, Math. Model. Phys. Eng. Cogn. Sci. **5**, 273 (2003), quant-ph/0301174.

[31] J.-G. Luque and J.-Y. Thibon, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 042303 (2003).

[32] J.-G. Luque and J.-Y. Thibon, J. Phys. A **39**, 371 (2005).

[33] D. Ž.Đoković and A. Osterloh, J. Math. Phys. **50**, 033509 (2009).

[34] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413 (1996).

[35] R. H. M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).

[36] S. J. van Enk (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0606017.

[37] P. Horodecki and A. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 127902 (2002).

[38] P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **319**, 1 (2003).

[39] P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 167901 (2003).

[40] A. Osterloh, arXiv:0810.1240; habilitation thesis.

[41] F. Mintert, M. Kuś, and A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 260502 (2005).

[42] C.-S. Yu and H.-S. Song, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 022324 (2007).

[43] A. Wong and N. Christensen, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 044301 (2001).

[44] S. Virmani and M. B. Plenio, Physics Letters A **268**, 31 (2000).

[45] A. Uhlmann, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 032307 (2000).

[46] R. Lohmayer, A. Osterloh, J. Siewert, and A. Uhlmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 260502 (2006).

[47] A. Osterloh, J. Siewert, and A. Uhlmann, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 032310 (2008).

[48] E. Jung, M.-R. Hwang, and J.-W. Son, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 024306 (2009).

[49] $\mathbb{P} = \frac{1}{2}\sigma_\mu \circ \sigma_\mu$, using Einstein summation convention